IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Steven J. LOCKE and Devanand PINTO

Title: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS VIA

ISOTOPICALLY DIFFERENTIATED

DERIVATIZATION

Appl. No.: 10/621,958

Filing Date: 7/16/2003

Examiner: David J. Venci

Art Unit: 1641

Confirmation 2039

Number:

CRITIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION Thereby confid that this paper is being electronically immension of the flower of the third property of the confidence of the flower electronic China, electronic Virginia vis EFS-Web on the date below. Sylvia L. Castillo (Signature) (Signature) December 18, 2007 (Dute of Transmission)

AMENDMENT AND REPLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action dated July 18, 2007, concerning the above-referenced patent application. The Action set a 3-month period to reply. This Amendment, together with a 2-month extension of time, is timely filed on or before its due date of December 18, 2007.

Amendments to the Specification are reflected on page 2 of this document.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this document.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 8 of this document.

Amendments to the Specification:

Please replace paragraph [00126] with the following:

[00126] Various amines, shown as Compounds in Table 2, were labelled with either CH₂O or CD₂O and reduced with sodium cyanoborohydride or sodium cyanoborodeuteride in acetonitrile which contained 10% (v/v) acetic acid or acetic acid d₄. Various amounts of each labelled amine sample were mixed and analysed by LC-MS. No digestion was required, as the labelled amines molecules were small. The MS used was a triple-quadrupole instrument (API III+) with an IonSpray. Source source-operated in the positive-ion mode. Table 2 provides the details of the analysis. Column 1 lists the names of the amines that were labelled. Column 2 lists the mass of the protonated pseudo-molecular ion. Columns 3 and 4 list the amount of differentially labelled amine combined for the analysis. Columns 5 and 6 list the expected and experimentally determined ratios, respectively. Finally, column 7 lists the calculated percent error. FIG. 8 shows the molecular structure of the amines. The lower panel shows the mass spectrum of 3-aminothiophenol labelled with CH₂O (m/z=123.0) and CD₂O (m/z=127.0) and NaCNBH₃. The expected ratio of intensities was 1.07 and the observed ratio was 1.10, corresponding to an error of 2.7%.